	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/530,254	STERNBERG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gyan Chandra	1646
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2007.		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-51 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 		
Attachment(s)	•	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date

Art Unit: 1646

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group 1, claim(s) 1-15, drawn to a method for identifying an agent that modulates the activity of a nuclear receptor hormone.

Group 2, claim(s) 16-24, and 45-49, drawn to a method for identifying an agent that inhibits nuclear hormone repression by a bacterial product.

Group 3, claim(s) 25-29, drawn to a method for identifying an active protein or other molecule from a cell expressing a nuclear hormone receptor, wherein the active protein or other molecule interacts with a bacterial product that modulates nuclear hormone receptor activity.

Group 4, claim(s) 30-33, and 51, drawn to a method of alleviating or preventing one or more symptoms of a bacterial disease, inflammatory reaction or autoimmune response in a mammalian subject.

Group 5, claim(s) 34 and 50, as drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising an effective amount of an agonist or antagonist of a nuclear hormone receptor.

Group 6, claim(s) 35-37, as drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising an effective amount of an agent that inhibits or enhances modulation of a nuclear hormone receptor by a bacterial product.

Group 7, claim(s) 38-44, drawn to a composition comprising a recombinantly or chemically modified analog, fragment or derivative of a bacterial product.

Art Unit: 1646

The inventions listed as Groups 1-7 do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Group 1 is anticipated by Berkley et al. (US 2003/0207833 A1, published on 6 November 2003. Berkeley et al teach a method of screening an agent that modulated the activity of a nuclear receptor (see page 75, left column and page 86, right column). Therefore, Group 1 lack a special technical feature and cannot share one with the other inventions of Groups 2-4.

Group 2, recites the special technical feature of identifying an agent that inhibits nuclear hormone repression by a bacterial product, which is not required by other methods of Groups 1, and 3-4.

Group 3, recites the special technical feature of identifying an active protein or other molecule from a cell expressing a nuclear hormone receptor, wherein the active protein or other molecule interacts with a bacterial product that modulates nuclear hormone receptor activity, which is not required by other methods of Groups 1-2, and 4.

Group 4, recites the special technical feature of alleviating or preventing one or more symptoms of a bacterial disease, inflammatory reaction or autoimmune response in a mammalian subject, which is not required by other methods of Groups 1-3.

Group 5, recites the special technical feature of a pharmaceutical composition comprising an effective amount of an agonist or antagonist of a nuclear hormone receptor, which is not required by other products of Groups 6-7.

Group 6, recites the special technical feature of a pharmaceutical composition comprising an effective amount of an agent that inhibits or enhances modulation of a nuclear hormone receptor by a bacterial product, which is not required by other products of Groups 5 and 7.

Group 7, recites the special technical feature of a composition comprising a recombinantly or chemically modified analog, fragment or derivative of a bacterial product, which is not required by other products of Groups 5-6.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be

Art Unit: 1646

entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

Page 4

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

Species Election:

Groups 1, 2 and 7

Claims 2-4, 20-22, 45 and 51 are drawn to a number of patentably distinct species (nuclear hormone receptors), e.g., a progesterone receptor, estrogen receptor, GR, AR, TR, VDR, RAR, RXR, PPAR, IRs and thyroid receptor.

Art Unit: 1646

Page 5

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 371 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 16, 45 and 51 are the examples of a generic claim.

Groups 1 and 2

Claims 9, 11, 17 and 18 are drawn to a number of patentably distinct species (bacterial product/toxin), e.g., anthrax lethal factor (LF), lethal toxin (LeTx), pyrogenic toxin superantigen (PTSAg).

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 371 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1 and 16 are the examples of a generic claim.

Groups 4, 5 and 6

Art Unit: 1646

Claims 30-35 and 37 are drawn to a number of patentably distinct species (diseases or symptoms), e.g., a bacterial disease, an inflammatory reaction or autoimmune response.

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 371 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35 and 37 are the examples of a generic claim.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Art Unit: 1646

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include

Art Unit: 1646

all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the **reply to this requirement to be complete** must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1646

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Gyan Chandra whose telephone number is (571) 272-

2922. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Gary Nickol can be reached on (571) 272-0835. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gyan Chandra Art Unit 1646

27 July 2007

Fax: 571-273-2922

/Robert S. Landsman/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1647

Page 9